

## A Barrett That Will Not Break

All of the new effects in the flossy, wave and strand Barretts, guaranteed by Kaufmann & Co. to be as good as any 25c Barrett; special 19c

**Kaufmann & Co.**

## Social and Personal

SEVERAL announcements of importance in the fashionable world were made yesterday.

Mr. and Mrs. Daniel D. Talley issued invitations for the marriage of their daughter, Kate Harris, to Benjamin Polard Cardozo on November 16, at 8 West Franklin Street. A reception, at which guests will include only relatives and few intimate friends, will be given after the ceremony.

Mr. Cardozo is a son of the late I. D. Cardozo, and is a member of the German and other social clubs of Richmond.

Cards have been sent out by Mrs. Benjamin Milnes for the marriage of her daughter, Alice Marie, to Herbert Clinton Whitehurst, on Wednesday evening, November 16, at 8:30 o'clock, in Centenary Methodist Episcopal Church.

Miss Hixey's Wedding.

The marriage of Miss Mary Harbourn

Rixey, daughter of the late John M. Rixey, who for a number of years represented the Eighth Virginia District in Congress, to Dr. Robert W. Compton will take place on Tuesday, November 15, at the home of Miss Rixey's mother, at Fry's Springs, near Charlottesville, Va. A number of guests will come from Washington to the wedding, including Rear Admiral Rixey, uncle of the bride, and Mrs. Rixey.

Dr. Compton is a member of the medical faculty of the University of Virginia.

**Engleton-Gary.**

Dr. Edward Engleton and Miss Helen Louise Gary were married very quietly by the Rev. Robert W. Forsyth yesterday at 11 o'clock, in St. Paul's Episcopal Church. No invitations or announcements were sent out. The bride and groom left on the 12:01 train for a Northern tour. When they return they will be at home at Amelia Courthouse, Va.

**Of Interest Here.**

The following account of a wedding celebrated Wednesday evening in Baltimore will be read with interest in Richmond, the home of the bridegroom's mother.

The marriage of Miss Margaret Sibyl Kemp, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles T. Kemp, to Robert Kemp Slaughter took place at 6 o'clock Wednesday evening at the home of her parents, 145 West Laval Street, Baltimore.

Only members of the immediate families were present at the ceremony, which was performed by Rev. John Smith, assistant pastor of Corpus Christi Church, assisted by Rev. Sydney S. Hurlburt, of Howard county, and Dr. John Webster Meloy, of the Catholic University, Washington.

The house was profusely decorated with palms, amallax and white chrysanthemums, with crimson dahlias and amallax in the dining room, and a string orchestra played the wedding march.

The bride was gowned in soft white satin, with rose point lace and an embroidery of pearls. She wore a tulle veil with a chaplet of orange blossoms

## THE HAMMOND STORY

### Old Time Friday Basement Bargains

81x90 Good Heavy Welded Seam Sheets, 60c value, 49c for.....

1/4 size Heavy Sheets, 50c value, for..... 39c

81x90 Linen Finished Sheets, good quality, for..... 55c

Yard Wide Flannellettes, in a large variety of patterns; worth 16 2-3c yard, for..... 12c

and carried a shower bouquet of Bride roses and lilies of the valley.

Miss Agnes Howard Kemp, one of this season's debutantes, was her sister's maid of honor, and wore a gown of yellow satin veiled with yellow marquisette and trimmed with an embroidery of gold and coral, and carried yellow chrysanthemums.

The two little flower girls, Miss Priscilla Howard and Miss Helen De Chantel Kemp, wore white frocks, with yellow ribbons, and carried yellow chrysanthemums.

Mr. Slaughter was attended by John E. Semmes, Jr., as best man.

A large reception followed the ceremony, after which Mr. and Mrs. Slaughter left for their wedding journey.

Mr. Slaughter is the son of the late John E. Slaughter, of King William county, Virginia, and Mrs. Slaughter, the latter now living in Richmond. He is a graduate of the University of Virginia and the University of Maryland and a member of the Maryland and Baltimore Bar Associations, though not practicing in profession.

Among the guests at the wedding were: Mrs. John B. Slaughter, mother of the bridegroom; Mr. and Mrs. W. L. Talarferro, Mr. and Mrs. Warren P. Taylor, all of Richmond.

**Keeler-Perkinson.**

The wedding of Miss Nellie Florence Perkinson, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Perkinson, to Benjamin Franklin Keeler, was celebrated at 5 P. M. yesterday at Battersea Place, Petersburg, by the Rev. Robert L. Gay, of Aulander, N. C.

House decorations were in palms, ferns and yellow and white chrysanthemums.

Miss Mary Webb rendered the wedding marches, and the bride was attended by her sister, Miss Grace Gordon Perkinson.

Benjamin Harrison, of Petersburg, was the groom's best man. The bride entered the parlor with her father. She wore a gown of white duchesse satin, trimmed with real lace and pearls. Her ornaments were diamonds and her flowers Bride roses and valley lilies. The maid of honor wore yellow messaline and carried yellow chrysanthemums.

Many out-of-town guests were present to witness the ceremony. The bride party came to Richmond in autos. Mr. and Mrs. Keeler took the northbound train for an extended tour, northwest at sea.

Mrs. Keeler, A. Atkinson and Mrs. Sidney Johnston Dudley were hostesses at a pretty tea Wednesday afternoon. The hall and parlors were artistically decorated with yellow and red chrysanthemums and yellow shaded candles. Mrs. Atkinson was gowned in white messaline, garnished with silver and Persian passementerie, and was assisted in receiving by Mrs. Dudley in an imported gown of silver spangled net over white chiffon, built on foundation of blue satin, and Mrs. Marmaduke Atkinson, of Martinsburg, W. Va., in a pale blue messaline empire gown, trimmed with real lace and blue chiffon.

The dining room was presided over by Miss Ethel Atkinson, who was assisted in white Landsdowne, embroidered in green butterflies.

Those assisting were Misses Alston Drake, Alice Hope, Elizabeth Catesby Jones and Margaret Matthews. Little Misses Jean Blair and Virginia Atkinson, received the cards. A pink and green effect in the dining-room was prettily carried out in the candies, cakes, ices, pink-shaded candles and pink roses. Champagne punch was served by Miss Elizabeth Scott, of Washington, D. C. Among the callers were Miss Maud Kent, Mrs. Samuel P. Vail, Mrs. Thomas Smith, Mrs. Blair, Miss Blair, Mrs. William Wilson Sale, Mrs. W. Wrightson Tunis, Mrs. Samuel D. Davies, Mrs. Robert W. Forsyth, Miss Newman, Mrs. William Marshall, Miss William L. Rogerson, Mrs. Armistead Gills, Miss Annie Carlton Williams, Miss Elizabeth R. Selden, Mrs. Frank L. LeCompte, Mrs. Channing Turner, Miss Denoon, Miss Mary Denoon, Mrs. Elizabeth Baker, Miss Charlotte E. W. Bartram, Mrs. Chesterman, Mrs. E. Weber Hoen, Mrs. Montague, Miss Rose Williams, Mrs. Ann, Mrs. C. M. Hughes, Mrs. Cunningham, Mrs. William G. Mahone, Miss Randolph, Miss Booker, Mrs. E. A. De Blanchard, Miss Mary Lewis, Mrs. Louise Watkins, Miss Williams, Mrs. Mayo, Miss Mary Lewis, Miss Rose Meredith, Miss Crenshaw and others.

**Scenes from Shakespeare.**

On Friday evening at 8:15 o'clock, in the Young Women's Christian Association auditorium, Mrs. W. M. Strother, formerly of Lynchburg, will give scenes from three Shakespearean plays: one from the tragedy of "Macbeth," another from "The Merchant of Venice," and one from the national play, "Henry V." Mrs. Strother has for several years specialized in giving Shakespearean plays, and the evening, which will be the formal opening of the W. Y. C. A. educational department, promises to be a most enjoyable one.

**In and Out of Town.**

Mr. and Mrs. Harry R. Cunningham are visiting Mr. and Mrs. E. D. Cunningham in Charlottesville, Va.

Miss Pauline Powers is the guest of Mrs. R. M. Powers, at Wickliffe, near Fredericksburg, Va.

Mrs. N. H. Franklin, of Elkhorn, Va., is the hostess of a house party and a number of Virginia girls are among her guests.

Miss Annie White and Captain James L. White, of Abingdon, are visiting Mr. and Mrs. A. P. Wilmer.

Mrs. W. W. King, of Staunton, Va., will be a special guest of the November meeting of the Civic Betterment Club at its November meeting.

Chilwell D. Langhorne, of Mirador, Mrs. Charles Langhorne and Mrs. Reginald Brooks are at the Homestead Hotel, Hot Springs. Mrs. Gibson and Mrs. Brooks have arranged for Archdeacon Frederick W. Nye, and Deaconess Boardman to give a mission-ary talk on the work done among the

poor mountaineers of the State of Virginia.

Mrs. Hugh Taylor has returned from a visit to relatives in Staunton, Va.

Mrs. May Embury Howlett has returned to her home in Fredericksburg, after a visit to the wife of a friend in New York about January 1, for a trip around the world.

Mrs. Thomas Bransford and Mrs. Robert W. Withers, of Suffolk, are guests of Mrs. E. M. McNamee, at 514 West Franklin Street.

Major William A. Anderson and family have returned to the city for the winter, and are at their home, 111 North Sixth Street.

Miss Dora Adams and Henry Adams are guests in the home of Professor and Mrs. C. M. Farmer, of Fredericksburg, Va.

Miss Maria Milnes has returned to Richmond after a brief visit to Norfolk friends.

**SUPREME COURT OPINIONS.**

Decisions in Fifteen Appeals by North Carolina Tribunal.

[Special to The Times-Dispatch.] Raleigh, N. C., October 27.—The North Carolina Supreme Court delivered opinions in fifteen appeals as follows:

Lancaster vs. Insurance Company, from Edgecombe, no error; Henderson, Liggett and Power Company vs. Casualty Company, from Vance, reversed; Penny vs. A. C. L. Railroad from New Hanover, new trial; Nowell vs. Royal Cotton Mills from Wake, no error; Smith vs. State vs. Corley, from Johnston, both appeals affirmed; Mott vs. Smith, from Columbus, no error; State vs. Stone (Sroggins appeal), from Edgecombe, State vs. Corley, from Union, no error; State vs. Huntley, from Anson, no error; Dunlap vs. Willett, from Chatham, no error; Webster vs. Williams, from Lee, no error; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; State vs. Cumby, from Guilford, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules; in the matter of James Norwood, from Orange, appeal dismissed for failure to file brief; Spaulding vs. Durham Cotton Mills, from Durham, appeal dismissed for failure to group exceptions as required by rule 19, part 2, of the rules;